

REMARKS

In the Office Action of September 21, 2007, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-12, 14, 15, 18-21, 23-25, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,396,612 B1 (hereinafter “Bjorndahl”). In addition, claims 3, 6-8, 13, 16, 17, 22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bjorndahl in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0186846 A1 (hereinafter “Nyberg et al.”) or U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0007641 A1 (hereinafter “Kinoshita”).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 11 and 20 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Bjorndahl. Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 26 and 27 have also been amended. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1, 11 and 20 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Bjorndahl, as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-29 be allowed.

I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 11 and 20

As amended, the independent claim 1 includes the limitation of “*wherein the electrical circuit includes a plurality of interfaces configured for communication over the first communication channel,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Bjorndahl. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Bjorndahl, and request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The cited reference of Bjorndahl discloses a dual mode mobile phone 20, which communicates with a dual mode private base station 21 via RF transmission on

a first communication channel and transmits encryption or security data via IR transmission on a second communication channel. Thus, the dual mode mobile phone of Bjorndahl includes a single interface (i.e., RF interface) for communication over the first communication channel. Consequently, the cited reference of Bjorndahl does not disclose the limitation of “*wherein the electrical circuit includes a plurality of interfaces configured for communication over the first communication channel,*” as recited in the amended independent 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Bjorndahl, and request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 11 and 20, which recite limitations that are similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 11 and 20 are also not anticipated by the cited reference of Bjorndahl, and request that the amended independent claims 11 and 20 be allowed.

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-19 and 21-29

Each of the dependent claims 2-10, 12-19 and 21-29 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 11 and 20. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

As an example, the dependent claim 7 recites the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains an interface type information item which indicates the interfaces that are available in the communication partner device for communication over the first communication channel.*” The cited references of Bjorndahl and Kinoshita disclose only a single interface for communication over a first communication channel. Consequently, the cited references of Bjorndahl and Kinoshita do not disclose the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains an interface type information item which indicates the interfaces that are available in the communication partner device for communication over the first communication channel,*” as recited in the dependent claim 7. Thus, the

dependent claim 7 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Kinoshita.

As another example, the dependent claim 8 recites the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains, in addition to the interface type information item, an interface preference information item which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the communication partner device containing the communication enable information item.*” Again, the cited references of Bjorndahl and Kinoshita disclose only a single interface for communication over a first communication channel. Consequently, the cited references of Bjorndahl and Kinoshita do not disclose the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains, in addition to the interface type information item, an interface preference information item which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the communication partner device containing the communication enable information item,*” as recited in the dependent claim 8. Thus, the dependent claim 8 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Kinoshita.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Harnisch et al.

Date: December 21, 2007

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300